



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

-07/767,231 09/27/91 MCGREGOR

D 11557

EXAMINER

SHANKAR, V

26M1/0607

RICHARD ESTY PETERSON
BIELEN, PETERSON & LAMPE
1990 NORTH CALIFORNIA BLVD., STE. 720
WALNUT CREEK, CA 94596

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2614

DATE MAILED:

06/07/93

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined

☒ Responsive to communication filed on 3-19-93 This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), -0 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152. |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-18 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims 16 are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☒ Claims 16 have been cancelled.
3. ☒ Claims 12-15, 17-18 are allowed.
4. ☒ Claims 1-11 are rejected.
5. ☐ Claims are objected to.
6. ☐ Claims are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☐ This application has been filed with Informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on . Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable. ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948).
10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on , has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner. ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on , has been ☐ approved. ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
12. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received
☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. ; filed on .
13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit 2614

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

2. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Molnar.

Consider claims 1 and 7, Molnar teaches a data interface for telephone system comprising a telephone unit (9.5), CPU (23), a microprocessor (27) in figure 1, a port (64) in figure 2. (See abstract, figures 1 and 2, column 1, line 66-column 2, line 37; column 2, line 60-column 7, line 15, figure 3, column 7, line 18-column 9, line 15). *Molnar further teaches a* microprocessor for interfacing the telephone for receiving signals from the telephone.

However, Molnar does not teach a translation means which includes a program.

However, it is well known in the art to use a program for the translation means for establishing protocol to signals from

Art Unit 2614

telephone to permit communication of telephone signals to a microprocessor and to CPU.

Thus, it would have been obvious to the ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the program for translation means in Molnar for the purpose of establishing communication from telephone signals to a microprocessor and to CPU.

For whats called for in claims 2-6, see figures 1-4, summary, column 2, line 60- column 10, line 22; and column 10, line 33-column 12, line 30.

For whats called for in claims 8-11, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 2-5.

3. Claims 12-15 and 17-18 are allowable over the prior art of record.

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11 have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vijay Shankar whose telephone number is (703) 305-4763.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750.

V. SHANKAR/TC
June 2, 1993


CURTIS KUNTZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2600